

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 17 are amended and claim 18 is added. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 17 can be found at least page 6, line 20 to page 7, line 17 of the specification. Support for the subject matter of claim 18 can be found at least at pg. 7, lines 1-9 of the specification. Thus, no new matter is added.

I. December 9, 2008 Personal Interview

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representatives by Examiner Larkin during the December 9, 2008 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

II. Objection to the Title

The Office Action objects to the title as allegedly being not descriptive. By this Amendment, the title is amended responsive to the objection.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

III. 35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection

The Office Action rejects claims 1-11 and 13-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,189,806 to McMurtry. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed during the interview, McMurtry fails to disclose "that the servo direction vector of the probe is at an angle not parallel and not perpendicular to said axis of the at least part nominally spiral path and at an angle not parallel to a plane perpendicular to said of the at least part nominally spiral path during the scanning of the object," as recited by independent claims 1 and 17. In particular, McMurtry clearly shows in Fig. 7 that the probe is servoed in a direction perpendicular to the axis of the spiral path and clearly shows in Fig. 9 that the probe is servoed in a direction parallel to the spiral path during the scanning process. Further, both

figures 7 and 9 show the servo direction of the probe being parallel to a plane perpendicular to the axis of the spiral path. Therefore, McMurtry fails to disclose the above-quoted feature of independent claims 1 and 17.

As discussed during the interview, McMurtry also fails to disclose

defining a second axis, said second axis being at an angle to the first axis;
rotating the second axis for an at least part revolution about the first axis
and translating the second axis in a direction parallel to the first axis;
moving the surface measurement probe to keep it on the axis,

as recited in independent claim 14. The Office Action alleges that McMurtry discloses this feature at col. 3, lines 5-10 where it discloses that "the surface sensing device may be made to follow a spiral, helical or other form of circular motion." However, McMurtry further discloses, at col. 11, line 62 - col. 12, line 2, that the helical path of the measurement probe is defined by driving the stylus in a circle while translating the stylus along the axis of rotation (McMurtry, Fig. 9, axis A4). In particular, McMurtry states that "since the head is also moving along the bore during the scanning operation, the stylus will travel with a helical motion over the bore surface to gather data about the surface along the length of the bore." Col. 11, line 67 - col 12, line 2. Therefore, McMurtry fails to disclose the above-quoted feature of the independent claim 14.

Therefore, the independent claims are patentable over McMurtry. The dependent claims are patentable at least for their various dependencies from the independent claims, as well as for the additional features they recite.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

IV. 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

The Office Action rejects claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McMurtry. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 12 is patentable at least for its dependency from independent claim 1, as well as for the additional features it recites.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

V. Claim 18 Defines Patentable Subject Matter

New claim 18 is patentable at least for its dependency from independent claim 17 as well as for the additional features it recites.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Srikant Viswanadham
Registration No. 60,111

JAO:LCS/hs

Date: December 18, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--